arXiv:1411.3405v5 [quant-ph] 13 Nov 2015

Quantum theory of the classical "black box"

Chris Fields

243 West Spain St., Sonoma, CA 95476 USA

fieldsres@gmail.com

November 16, 2015

Abstract

It is shown that "black boxes," defined by the classical cybernetics of the 1950s as systems with unknown numbers of observationally-inaccessible internal degrees of freedom, are quantum systems and vice-versa. This equivalence brings powerful no-go theorems for black boxes to bear on all laboratory operations involving quantum systems. As the physical interpretation of the classical black box is straightforward, it also provides a straightforward physical interpretation for quantum theory.

Keywords: Black box; Classical cybernetics; Landauer's principle; No-go theorems; Separability; Time

PACS: 03.65Ta, 03.67.Hk

1 Introduction

> The theory of the Black Box is merely the theory of real objects or systems, when close attention is given to the question, relating object and observer, about what information comes from the object, and how it is obtained.
>
> – W. Ross Ashby, 1956 ([1] p. 110)

In classical cybernetics, a *black box* is a system with observable overt behavior but an unknown number of observationally-inaccessible internal degrees of freedom (e.g. [1, 2]). The black box concept is motivated by the predicament of a reverse engineer who must examine a system "from the outside" and then deliver a best hypothesis about what the

system is and does. An observer restricted to finite means can interact with a black box only by altering the states of a finite number of "input" degrees of freedom at finite resolution and then observing the behavior of a finite number of "output" degrees of freedom at finite resolution. The interaction can, therefore, be represented as an exchange of finite bit strings between an observer and an unknown, otherwise inaccessible system along a classical information channel [3]. Using the reverse-engineering metaphor of a sealed device that could be manipulated and its overt behavior observed but could not be opened for internal inspection, Ashby [1] and Moore [2] independently proved that finite observations at finite resolution are insufficient to uniquely specify the "machine table," the set of all possible input-output transitions, of any black box. The proof is straightforward: if the number of internal states of the box is unknown and cannot be determined, there can be no assurance that the finite number of manipulations that have been performed have accessed all of the internal states of the box. Without such assurance, there can be no assurance that all possible outputs of the box have been observed, and hence no assurance that a provisional machine table recording the observed input-output transitions provides a complete listing of all possible input-output transitions. An observer who interacts with a black box can, therefore, place a lower limit on the complexity of the box's behavior, but cannot, by finite observation, place an upper limit on the complexity of the box's behavior. The very next output from any black box can be a complete surprise.

It is shown here that if an observer is restricted to interacting solely with a black box, the black box can only correctly be described, from the observer's perspective, as a quantum system. Indeed the standard quantum-theoretic formalism emerges naturally from a first-principles description of the interaction between an observer and a black box, provided that Landauer's principle [4, 5] that irreversibly encoding classical information costs finite free energy is also assumed. When quantum theory is viewed as describing the interaction of an observer with a black box, the Bell and Kochen-Specker theorems can be interpreted as statements that particular laboratory operations are interactions with a black box. These theorems naturally generalize to the claim that *all* laboratory operations are interactions with a black box. As human observers are restricted, in principle, to finite observational means, quantum theory provides a complete description of human-observable phenomena at all scales.

2 Formal characterization of a black box

The informal notion of an *observer* who can irreversibly record classical outcomes as bit strings on some physical medium is assumed. Observers are assumed to be subject to Landauer's principle [4, 5]; hence a thermodynamically optimal observer $\mathbf{O}$ must expend $0.7kT_{\mathbf{O}}$ of free energy to record each bit, where k is Boltzmann's constant and $T_{\mathbf{O}}$ is the temperature of $\mathbf{O}$. For simplicity, observers are assumed to be optimal in this sense. Any observer limited to a finite energy budget is limited by Landauer's principle to finite observations. As the theory of the black box is traditionally concerned only with finite observations, a finite energy budget for observers is assumed.

The informal notion of a *physical system* that can occupy multiple *physical states* and can undergo *physical interactions* with other physical systems is also assumed. Whether physical systems and their states are "classical" or "quantum" and the appropriate formal descriptions of physical states, state spaces and physical interactions are left open. As observers are subject to Landauer's principle, they are considered to be physical systems.

Definition: A *black box* is a physical system **B** such that, for any observer **O**,

1. The information obtained by **O** via an instantaneous **O** - **B** interaction is fully specified by some finite bit string $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >$, referred to as **O**'s *observational outcome* from **B** for that interaction.

2. No finite collection of observational outcomes is sufficient to specify the machine table of **B**.

The second clause states the conclusion of the Ashby - Moore theorem noted earlier, and hence expresses the traditional conditions that **O** has no access to the interior of **B**, no *a priori* knowledge of the internal degrees of freedom, structure of or mechanism implemented by **B**, and hence no means of placing an upper limit on the potential complexity of **B**'s input-output behavior.

The above definition differs from traditional, more informal definitions (e.g. [1, 2]) in two ways. First, it elides the traditional distinction between the "input" and "output" degrees of freedom of **B**. An observer **O** can only construct a machine table if she can observe her manipulations of the "input" degrees of freedom of **B**; hence these manipulations can be combined with the "output" observations in a single observational outcome $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >$ without loss of generality. As observational outcomes are taken to be recorded on a physical medium by **O**, they can be considered to be "encoded" by **O**. How they are presented to **O** by **B** can then be left open.

The second difference from traditional definitions is the assumption that observational outcomes may be represented as bit strings of a fixed length n. This assumption restricts **O**'s memory system to n-bit strings and effectively limits both the resolution and the dynamic range with which states of **B** are observed. Satisfaction of the second clause of the definition, therefore, assures the following:

Lemma 1: If a black box **B** is deterministic, the observational outcomes obtained from **B** under-determine its physical state.

Proof: Assume otherwise. In this case, **B** can be represented as a deterministic finite state machine with 2^n states and its machine table can be fully specified with 2^{2n} observations. This contradicts the second clause of the definition above. □

Lemma 1 shows that the second clause of the above definition is very strong. If **B** is a black box, even an observation of finite uninterrupted repeats of the same outcome is insufficient to specify the machine table of **B**. It is always possible that a counter, for example, has been built into **B**'s internal mechanism that generates distinct outcomes after some large, but finite, number of repeats. Thus we also have the following:

Lemma 2: Finite observations of a deterministic black box **B** are insufficient to demonstrate that **B** is not a Turing machine.

Proof: Any finite sequence of observational outcomes defines a finite-state machine. Any such machine can be emulated by an arbitrary number of distinct Turing machines. □

The observational outcomes obtained from **B** can, with Lemma 2, be viewed as finite samples of the tape of an unknown Turing machine.

Lemma 1 shows that no black box can be demonstrated to have reached a "halt" state following which all state transitions are identities. It also blocks the "Occam's razor" assumption that identical observational outcomes indicate identical states of **B**. Lemma 2 shows that every black box **B** can be assumed to be deterministic without loss of generality, as a deterministic Turing machine can emulate any stochastic finite-state machine. The sense in which outcomes from black boxes can be considered "probabilistic" will be discussed in §4 below in connection with the status of the Born rule.

3 No-go theorems for black boxes

The two Lemmas demonstrated above are, effectively, no-go results: they rule out particular inferences from observational data. This section uses similar reasoning to establish further such no-go results.

Let **B** be a deterministic black box and consider a finite sequence of observational outcomes $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_1, \ldots, < o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_N$ obtained from **B**. By Lemma 1 above, the outcome $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_k$ under-determines the physical state b_k of **B** for every k. As nothing is known about the mechanism that generates $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_k$ from b_k, two possibilities must be considered: either 1) each of the bit values o_{ik} depends on b_k as a whole or 2) each bit value o_{ik} depends only on some proper component b_{ik}, where no assumption is made about either the dimension of this component or its relation to other components of b_k. As any assumption otherwise would constitute *a priori* knowledge of **B**'s mechanism for any observer, no generality is lost by assuming that the value of each bit o_{ik} under-determines b_k in case 1) above and under-determines b_{ik} in case 2). The relationship between physical states of **B** and observed outcomes can then be written as:

$$\text{Case 1: } \forall b_k \in \{b_k\}, b_k \mapsto o_{ik} \tag{1}$$

$$\text{Case 2: } \forall b_{ik} \in \{b_{ik}\}, b_{ik} \mapsto o_{ik} \tag{2}$$

where $\{b_k\}$ and $\{b_{ik}\}$ indicate sets of observationally-indistinguishable states or components of states that generate the bit value o_{ik}.

Now consider the conditions under which a black box **B** can be separated into two independent black boxes $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2$. Independence requires that the k^{th} observational outcome from **B** can be written, re-ordering the bits as necessary, as $< o_1, \ldots, o_i, o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ where the bit values $o_{1k}, \ldots, o_{ik}$ are independent of the bit values $o_{jk}, \ldots, o_{nk}$ for all k; in

this case $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ can be considered the outcome from $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ can be considered the outcome from $\mathbf{B}_2$.

Lemma 3: A black box $\mathbf{B}$ with observational outcomes $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_k$ can be separated into two independent black boxes $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2$ with observational outcomes $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ and $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ respectively if but only if for every k, $\{b_k\}$ can be partitioned into non-overlapping subsets $\{b_{1k}\}$ and $\{b_{2k}\}$ such that $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ is independent of $\{b_{2k}\}$ and $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ is independent of $\{b_{1k}\}$.

Proof : The if direction is clear. For the only-if direction, assume otherwise, i.e. that there is at least one k for which $\{b_k\}$ cannot be partitioned into non-overlapping subsets $\{b_{1k}\}$ and $\{b_{2k}\}$ such that $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ is independent of $\{b_{2k}\}$ and $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ is independent of $\{b_{1k}\}$. In this case, either $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ depends on $\{b_{2k}\}$ or $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ depends on $\{b_{1k}\}$. Either way, $\mathbf{B}$ cannot be separated into independent black boxes $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2$. □

A priori knowledge that $\mathbf{B}$ can be separated in this way cannot be assumed, hence the question of interest is whether separability can be inferred by finite observation of outcomes from $\mathbf{B}$.

Theorem 1 (non-separability): No finite record of observable outcomes from a black box $\mathbf{B}$ is sufficient to separate $\mathbf{B}$ into two independent black boxes $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2$.

Proof: Assume otherwise, i.e. that some finite number N of outcomes $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_k$ is sufficient to separate $\mathbf{B}$ into two independent black boxes $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2$. Let $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ be the outcomes of $\mathbf{B}_1$ and $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ be the outcomes of $\mathbf{B}_2$. In this case, the outcomes $< o_1, \ldots, o_i >_k$ can be taken to collectively encode a single outcome value "1" and the outcomes $< o_j, \ldots, o_n >_k$ can be taken to collectively encode a single outcome value "0." With this encoding, $\mathbf{B}$'s outcome sequence comprises N copies of $< 1, 0 >$. As these N outcomes are sufficient by assumption for separation, all future outcomes from $\mathbf{B}$ must also be $< 1, 0 >$. The machine table of $\mathbf{B}$ is thus fully specified, contradicting clause 2) of the definition of a black box. □

Remark: If N outcomes were sufficient to separate $\mathbf{B}$, then no black box could be found that emits N copies of $< 1, 0 >$ and then changes its behavior, e.g. to emitting random two-bit pairs. But this is absurd; such a black box can be constructed with a counter and a random-number generator.

Remark: While Theorem 1 shows that $\mathbf{B}$ cannot be separated by finite observation, the inaccessibility of $\mathbf{B}$'s internal mechanism also prevents any demonstration by finite observation that particular outcome components o_i and o_j are internally coupled and hence *not* independent.

That black boxes are not separable by finite observation suggests that they may be formally analogous to quantum systems. This analogy is made stronger by the following:

Lemma 4: A black box $\mathbf{B}$ cannot be bounded by finite observation.

Proof: Let ζ be a degree of freedom. To show that ζ is not a degree of freedom of $\mathbf{B}$, an observer $\mathbf{O}$ must show either that a) no state of ζ depends on any state b of $\mathbf{B}$ or, if this

is not possible, that b) no state of ζ is a component of any state b of $\mathbf{B}$. Neither a) nor b) can be demonstrated by finite observation, however, as demonstrating either requires examining all possible states of $\mathbf{B}$. $\square$

That black boxes cannot be bounded is not contemplated in the traditional cybernetics literature, in which it is imagined that a black box is a discrete system, such as a captured weapon, that can be brought into the laboratory and examined with available tools. This traditional conception tacitly assumes that some subset of the observational outcomes obtained from the black box – e.g. outcomes specifying its size, shape and position – are sufficient to fully distinguish the degrees of freedom of the black box from all other degrees of freedom. This is an *a priori* assumption that is, as shown by Lemma 4, inconsistent with the formal characterization of a black box as a system having an unknown number of degrees of freedom that are inaccessible in principle.

Theorem 2 (universality): An observer that interacts with a black box interacts only with a black box.

Proof: Suppose $\mathbf{O}$ interacts with a black box $\mathbf{B}$ with observational outcomes $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_k$. Let ζ be a degree of freedom outside of $\mathbf{B}$, assuming as the worst case that ζ is a "white box" degree of freedom with outcomes $< \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_m >_k$ that completely specify its state. Now consider the system $\mathbf{S}$ that is the concatenation of $\mathbf{B}$ with ζ. The concatenated outcome $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_m >_k$ fully specifies the information that $\mathbf{O}$ can obtain from $\mathbf{S}$. By Lemma 4 above, the interaction between ζ and $\mathbf{B}$ cannot be determined; hence the outcome components $< \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_m >_k$ contribute nothing to specifying the machine table of $\mathbf{B}$. Specifying the machine table of $\mathbf{S}$ requires, however, specifying the machine table of $\mathbf{B}$. Hence $\mathbf{S}$ is a black box. $\square$

Theorem 2 vindicates Ashby's remark that "the theory of the Black Box is merely the theory of real objects or systems" by showing that the theory of the Black Box not only applies to all systems across the board, but effectively incorporates all systems into a single black box. It has two obvious corollaries:

Corollary 2.1: An observer $\mathbf{O}$ interacting with a black box $\mathbf{B}$ has no independent access to external reference frames.

Proof: Any reference frame must have at least one degree of freedom (e.g. [6]), which by Theorem 2 is inside $\mathbf{B}$, not outside. $\square$

Corollary 2.2: Two observers interacting with a black box $\mathbf{B}$ have no independent communication channel.

Proof: Any such communication channel must have at least one degree of freedom, which by Theorem 2 is inside $\mathbf{B}$, not outside. $\square$

Corollary 2.2 blocks, in particular, any assumption that two observers $\mathbf{O}$ and $\mathbf{O}'$ of a single black box can employ an independent classical communication channel to compare observational results or to notify each other of planned manipulations. Hence even if the observational outcomes $< o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_n >_k$ and $< o'_1, o'_2, \ldots, o'_m >_k$ obtained by $\mathbf{O}$ and $\mathbf{O}'$ are perfectly correlated, neither observer can obtain evidence for this correlation. Corollary

2.2 is, therefore, analogous to the no-communication theorem for quantum systems (e.g. [7]), again suggesting a formal analogy between quantum systems and black boxes.

4 Black boxes are quantum systems

With Theorem 2, the physical universe **U** can be regarded as partitioned, relative to any observer **O**, into two interacting components, **O** and a black box $\mathbf{B_O}$ comprising all degrees of freedom of **U** that are not degrees of freedom of **O**. We now show that standard quantum theory is the natural description of the interaction between **O** and $\mathbf{B_O}$. The demonstration reverses the usual order of presenting the axioms of quantum theory (e.g. [8, 9]), beginning with the representation of measurement and ending with the specification of a Hilbert space.

By corollary 2.1, an observer who interacts with a black box $\mathbf{B_O}$ has no access to an independent time reference frame. The sequence of observed outcomes, however, defines an "internal" time reference frame for **O**; call the coordinate so defined $t_\mathbf{O}$. As no other time reference frame is available to **O**, the interval $\Delta t_\mathbf{O}$ between outcomes can be treated as constant by definition.

As **O** and $\mathbf{B_O}$ are in continuous interaction, if **O** is optimal as assumed above, the interval $\Delta t_\mathbf{O}$ is the interval required for **O** to record an observational outcome. The action required to record an n bit outcome is then:

$$n\vartheta_\mathbf{O} = n \cdot 0.7kT_\mathbf{O}\Delta t_\mathbf{O}. \tag{3}$$

The **O**-relative quantum of action $\vartheta_\mathbf{O}$ has, in this case, an unambiguous physical interpretation as the action required for **O** to encode one bit. As by Corollaries 2.1 and 2.2 observers have no independent reference frames for or means of comparing their respective values $T_\mathbf{O}$ and $\Delta t_\mathbf{O}$, the "**O**" index can be dropped and the value $\vartheta/(0.7k)$ can be treated as observer-independent without loss of generality.

Remark: Re-arranging Eq. 3, $T_\mathbf{O} = (\vartheta/(0.7k))/(\Delta t_\mathbf{O})$. The "temperature" of **O** thus measures the rate at which **O** acquires and encodes information. As encoding information requires a state change, $T_\mathbf{O}$ measures the rate of state changes as required by the classical kinetic theory.

The **O**-relative time coordinate $t_\mathbf{O}$ can be used to parameterize the mapping from states of $\mathbf{B_O}$ to outcome values. As $\mathbf{B_O}$ is not separable by Theorem 1, the previous "Case 1" (Eq. 1) can be assumed without loss of generality:

$$\forall b_k \in \{b_k\}, E_{ik}(t_\mathbf{O}) : b_k(t_\mathbf{O}) \mapsto o_{ik}(t_\mathbf{O}) \tag{4}$$

for states b_k of $\mathbf{B_O}$ and some map $E_{ik}(t_\mathbf{O})$. Now consider a particular o_{ik}. For each k, $o_{ik} = 0$ or $o_{ik} = 1$. Choosing an origin for $t_\mathbf{O}$ such that $t_\mathbf{O} = k\Delta t_\mathbf{O}$ when the k^{th} observational outcome is received, we can write $E_{ik} = \{E_{0ik}, E_{1ik}\}$, where for each k and hence each such integer time:

$$\forall b_k \in \{b_k\}, E_{0ik} : b_k \mapsto 0 \text{ and } E_{1ik} : b_k \mapsto 1. \tag{5}$$

With this definition, the partial maps E_{0ik} and E_{1ik} are clearly orthogonal. As at every k, $o_{ik} = 0$ or $o_{ik} = 1$ are the only possibilities, these maps also resolve the identity on the set $\{b_k\}$ of states. The only requirement on $\{b_k\}$ is that it be large enough to be under-determined by any finite sequence of observational outcomes, so it is sufficient to assume that $\{b_k\}$ is countable. In this case $\{b_k\}$ is measurable and the composite map E_{ik} is a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) on $\{b_k\}$. Black boxes share with quantum systems, therefore, the requirement that states can be mapped to observational outcomes by POVMs. As any finite observational outcome can be generated by a POVM with this construction, it is clear that observational outcomes from a black box can contain no more information than is encodable by a POVM.

Focusing still on a particular o_{ik}, let us ask: what is the propagator $U_i(k\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}} \rightarrow (k{+}1)\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}) : o_{ik}(k\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}) \mapsto o_{ik}((k+1)\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}})$? Note that at times $\ldots, k\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}, (k+1)\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}, (k+2)\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}, \ldots$ o_{ik} has a sequence of binary values, e.g. $\ldots, 0, 1, 1, \ldots$. Such a sequence can equally well be represented by operator actions $\ldots, E_{0ik}, E_{1ik}, E_{1ik}, \ldots$. The POVM E_{ik} is, therefore, periodic with period $\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}$, and its components E_{0ik} and E_{1ik} must have phases that are anti-correlated at each time $k\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}$ at which an outcome is generated. Which of E_{0ik} and E_{1ik} acts at any particular time is, moreover, unpredictable in principle; hence the phases cannot be real-valued functions. The most general function satisfying these requirements for all k is:

$$U_i(t_{\mathbf{O}}) = \alpha_0 e^{-\imath\varphi_0(t_{\mathbf{O}})t_{\mathbf{O}}} E_{0i} + \alpha_1 e^{-\imath\varphi_1(t_{\mathbf{O}})t_{\mathbf{O}}} E_{1i}, \tag{6}$$

where the real time-dependent phases $\varphi_0(t_{\mathbf{O}})$ and $\varphi_1(t_{\mathbf{O}})$ are anti-correlated at every $k\Delta t_{\mathbf{O}}$ and the real coefficients α_0 and α_1 allow the normalization $\alpha_0^2 + \alpha_1^2 = 1$.

Defining the inverse maps as $E_{0ik}^{-1} : o_{ik} \mapsto \{b_k\}$ and $E_{1ik}^{-1} : o_{ik} \mapsto \{b_k\}$ for every i, k, the operator $U_i(t_{\mathbf{O}})$ defined by Eq. 6 is unitary. The observable dynamics of any black box $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{O}}$ must, therefore, be symmetric in the observer-relative time coordinate $t_{\mathbf{O}}$. This time symmetry corresponds to $\mathbf{O}$ being unable to distinguish a sequence of observational outcomes read in the forward direction from one read in the reverse direction. This is itself a natural consequence of $\mathbf{O}$'s principled lack of knowledge of the mechanism implemented by $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{O}}$.

As $\alpha_0^2{+}\alpha_1^2 = 1$ it is natural to interpret α_0^2 and α_1^2 as probabilities associated with the POVM components E_{0i} and E_{1i} respectively. Such probabilities are clearly $\mathbf{O}$-relative and hence "subjective" as in, e.g. quantum Bayesianism [10]. As probabilities defined in this way correspond to frequencies of observations only in the limit as the number of observations becomes infinite, the coefficients α_0 and α_1 and hence the probabilities associated with them can be taken to be constant without loss of generality. The Born rule is, therefore, a pragmatic assumption as it is in quantum Bayesianism, not a theorem.

The formal analogy between black boxes and quantum systems is completed by considering the outcome component o_i for each k not as a binary number but as a set $\{|0_i\rangle, |1_i\rangle\}$ of basis vectors of a two-dimensional vector space. Let $|o_i(t_{\mathbf{O}})\rangle$ be a vector in this space. Then by definition, $U_i : |o_i(t_{\mathbf{O}})\rangle \mapsto |o_i(t_{\mathbf{O}} + \Delta t_{\mathbf{O}})\rangle$. Replacing operators by the components they

generate, Eq. 6 can then be re-written:

$$|o_i(t_{\mathbf{O}})\rangle = \alpha_{0i}e^{-\imath\varphi_{0i}(t_{\mathbf{O}})t_{\mathbf{O}}}|0_i\rangle + \alpha_{1i}e^{-\imath\varphi_{1i}(t_{\mathbf{O}})t_{\mathbf{O}}}|1_i\rangle. \quad (7)$$

Letting $|o\rangle$ be a vector in the $2n$-dimensional space spanned by the full collection of n pairs of such basis vectors, we have:

$$|o(t_{\mathbf{O}})\rangle = \sum_i (\alpha_{0i}e^{-\imath\varphi_{0i}(t_{\mathbf{O}})t_{\mathbf{O}}}|0_i\rangle + \alpha_{1i}e^{-\imath\varphi_{1i}(t_{\mathbf{O}})t_{\mathbf{O}}}|1_i\rangle). \quad (8)$$

The space of these vectors is clearly a $2n$-dimensional Hilbert space, completing the formal analogy with quantum theory.

Having shown that the theory of finite observations from a black box is quantum theory, we have:

Theorem 3 (equivalence): All black boxes are quantum systems and vice versa.

Proof: A physical system satisfying the standard axioms of quantum theory is, by definition, a quantum system. The above construction shows that an arbitrary black box is described by these axioms; hence an arbitrary black box is a quantum system. A quantum system, on the other hand, is a system from which finite observational outcomes can be obtained, but for which the sequence of outcomes and hence the "machine table" of all possible transitions between outcomes cannot be specified. Hence any quantum system is a black box. □

Remark: Infinite-dimensional quantum systems can, in principle, be acted upon by infinite-dimensional POVMs to generate infinite-dimensional outcomes. However, only some finite sample of such an outcome can be recorded by an observer subject to a finite energy budget. No such finite sample enables specification of a machine table. Hence Theorem 3 is completely general for any such observer.

5 Physical interpretation

Theorem 3 provides an immediate and straightforward physical interpretation of quantum theory: quantum systems are classical black boxes. As such, they can be considered to have arbitrary numbers of "hidden" degrees of freedom that are unobservable in principle. The "dimension" of a quantum system for an observer **O** is the dimension of the observational outcomes **O** can obtain, a dimension limited by **O**'s memory capacity. The "state" of a quantum system at the time **O** makes an observation is the observational outcome that is received, and its state when unobserved is a superposition of the outcomes that could be received, as in Eq. 8. Neither multiple worlds nor collapsing wave functions need be assumed, and the "quantum to classical transition" is just the process of observation. Whether the hidden degrees of freedom are "ontically" classical or quantum is not an empirical question; since they cannot be observed, they can be regarded as classical without loss of generality. Hence no specifically "quantum world" need be postulated.

Identifying quantum systems with black boxes has the immediate consequence that the no-go theorems in §3 above apply to all finite observations of and hence all finite laboratory operations on quantum systems. By Theorem 1, no black box can be separated by finite observation. Therefore by Theorem 3, no quantum system can be separated by finite observation. In particular, observational outcomes obtained from a quantum system **S** cannot be allocated to proper subsystems of **S** by finite observation. Hence no state of **S** can be demonstrated, by finite observation, not to be entangled. As Theorem 2 extends **S** to the entire observed world, no finite observation can demonstrate that the observed world is not in an entangled state.

Two central assumptions of the "classical worldview" are that:

1. Observational outcomes can be exclusively and unambiguously attributed to single, identified systems.

2. States of spatially distant systems can be independently prepared, and classical information about system preparation can be communicated between observers without affecting the prepared state(s).

Both of these assumptions rely, in turn, on the observed world being in a separable state. If the observed world is a quantum system and hence a black box, this assumption is contradicted by Theorem 1. The Bell and Kochen-Specker theorems both demonstrate failures of separability in particular operational settings; the steadily-expanding list of experimental confirmations of Bell inequality violations provides increasing evidence that the world is indeed a quantum system and hence that Theorem 1 indeed holds. The recent Pusey-Barrett-Rudolph theorem [11] shows that the second of these assumptions implies that the ontic states of physical systems must be quantum states. In the present context, it is the theorem's contrapositive that is relevant: because ontic states of the world need not be quantum states, the independent preparation assumption cannot be true.

If entanglement is a ubiquitous and permanent feature of the global state of the observed world, it is not a locally-manipulable resource. It emerges as a resource only when it is limited, by stipulation, to particular, isolated subsystems of the observed world. Such limitations are only effective if the existence of an independent classical communication channel between observers has also been stipulated (e.g. [6]). This is, as shown by Corollary 2.2, a stipulation of one or more "white box" degrees of freedom, those which define the communication channel. Any such stipulation requires an assumption that observers can identify the degrees of freedom composing the channel by finite observations. If the world is a quantum system and hence a black box, this identifiability assumption is illegitimate.

6 Conclusion

What has been shown here is that the classical notion of a black box, which was developed in the 1950s to describe in-principle limitations of reverse-engineering methodologies, is

formally equivalent to the notion of a quantum system. While the latter notion is traditionally defined by apparently *ad hoc* mathematical axioms and has been subject to decades of interpretational difficulties, the former is straightforward and unproblematic. Indeed the axioms of quantum theory emerge naturally as descriptions of the interaction between an observer limited to finite means and a black box.

The present result generalizes the results of Spekkens [12] and others (see [13] for review) showing that fragments of quantum theory can be obtained from specific classical models as well as a previous result showing that the operational consequences of the Bell and Kochen-Specker theorems follow from the Ashby-Moore theorem [14]. If even a completely classical world appears to an observer as a black box, its observable states are entangled and all inferences from finite observations are limited by powerful no-go theorems. Observational outcomes cannot, in particular, be unambiguously assigned to particular subsystems, and preparation procedures cannot be assumed to affect only particular subsystems.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Eric Dietrich, Miroljub Dugić, Don Hoffman and Chetan Prakash for relevant discussions and to The Federico and Elvia Faggin Foundation for financial support during the final stages of this work..

References

[1] W. R. Ashby. *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1956.

[2] E. F. Moore. Gedankenexperiments on sequential machines. In C. W. Shannon and J. McCarthy, editors, *Autonoma Studies*, pages 129-155. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1956.

[3] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 27: 379-423, 1948.

[4] R. Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM J. Research Development*, 5: 183-195, 1961.

[5] R. Landauer. Information is a physical entity. *Physica A*, 263: 63-67, 1999.

[6] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens. Reference frames, superselection rules, and quantum information. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 79:555-609, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0610030v3.

[7] A. Peres and D. R. Terno. Quantum information and relativity theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 76: 93-123, 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0212023v2.

[8] M. A. Neilsen and I. L. Chaung. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.

[9] W. H. Zurek. Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 75: 715-775, 2003. arXiv:quant-ph/0105127v3.

[10] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack. Quantum Bayesian coherence. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 85: 1693-1715, 2013. arXiv:0906.2187v1 [quant-ph].

[11] M. F. Pusey MF, J. Barrett and T. Rudolph. On the reality of the quantum state. *Nature Physics*, 8: 475-478, 2012. arXiv:1111.3328v3 [quant-ph].

[12] R. W. Spekkens. Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75: 032110. arxiv:quant-ph/0401052v2.

[13] Jennings D, Leifer M. No return to classical reality. *Contemp. Phys.*, in press, 2015. arxiv:1501.03202v2 [quant-ph].

[14] C. Fields. Bell's theorem from Moore's theorem. *Int. J. Gen. Syst.*, 42: 376-385, 2013. arXiv:1201.3672v6 [quant-ph].